



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/19/3243279

358 Great West Road, Hounslow, Middx TW5 0BA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sandev Rao against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00505/358/PA3, dated 6 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is deemed to be granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for Ground floor rear extension 6 metres deep, maximum height of 3 metres, 3 metres high to the eaves, at 358 Great West Road, Hounslow, Middx TW5 0BA in accordance with the application ref 00505/358/PA3 made on 6 September 2019, and the details submitted with it, including plan no's PL2/VP/2979-00 Rev Revision, PL2/VP/2979-01 Rev Revision, PL/VP/2979-02 Rev Revision, PL2/VP/2979-03 Rev Revision, pursuant to Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.4(2).

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been amended from the original description within the application form and is described as 'Ground floor rear extension 6 metres deep, maximum height of 3 metres, 3 metres high to the eaves' and I concur with this description.
3. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended, under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Part A.4(7) requires the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. My determination of this appeal has been made on the same basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining premises.

Reasons

5. No 358 Great West Road is semi-detached to No 360. Due to the configuration of the appeal property, there would be no impact of the development on the adjacent occupiers of neighbouring No 356. Broadly speaking, the appeal dwelling is located within the middle of the plot. The attached neighbour of 360 Great West Road has extended to the rear by virtue of a single storey extension, close to the party boundary with the appeal site, with a sloping roof over.
6. The proposed extension would be located adjacent to the boundary of No 360, extending 6m beyond the original rear wall of the host property and would have an approximate height of 3m at the eaves, flat roofed. The enlarged living room and kitchen of No 360 extends approximately 3.5m from the rear of the dwelling. The occupants would have oblique views from the rear windows onto the proposed flank wall, above the existing boundary treatment.
7. However, given the location of their own extension, the occupants would view a limited extent of approximately 2.5m of wall, beyond that of their own. I have taken into account the neighbour's objection in respect of the effect on their living conditions. Considering the depth of extension that would be visible and its height, taken with the fact that both gardens are otherwise open in character, the development would not create a sense of enclosure to the occupiers of No 360.
8. The proposed extension is located to the west side of No 360. Their existing rear windows and garden face north. Given the orientation of the site, an element of overshadowing may occur, however, this would be limited.
9. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines 2017 advises that single-storey extensions to semi-detached dwellings are limited to a maximum depth of 3.65m in order to appear subservient to the host dwelling and to protect the living conditions of neighbours. The GPDO allows considerably more flexibility to extend dwellings under prior approval applications. I have however had regard to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers in respect of the size of extension proposed. Based on my assessment, no demonstrable harm would arise to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers as a result of the proposal.
10. In that respect, the proposal meets the requirements of London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015-2030), Policies CC2, especially part (t), and SC7, in particular part (f), regarding the need for residential extensions to avoid or minimise harm to neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and prior approval should be granted.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR